

## **DETAILED ACTION**

***This office action is in response to the submission filed on 9/22/2008. Claims 1-12, 19-25 are amended for examination.***

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 19-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument regarding the objections of claims 19 and 22, the argument is persuasive; the objections of claims 19 and 22 are withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Justice, Jr. et al (us pat 6,418,469) (hereinafter Justice) in view of Fuss et al (us pat 6,401,119) (hereinafter Fuss) and further in view of Johnson (us pat 6,275,855).

**As regarding claim 1**, Justice discloses receiving network management data (col.1, lines 25-39), and determining if said network management data indicates said

resolution of a previous event generated by said network management system in response to previously received network management data (col.1, lines 25-67, col.3, lines 26-67; col.4, lines 1-33, also see Fig.5, the log represents the list of action and recurring action, determine if the event in the log is resolved, then the management program updates the event list in response to the condition being resolved, the previous event is just an event in the log); maintaining an event list (see col.1, lines 25-39, event list); automatically removing said previous event from a memory of said network management system (see Justice col.1, lines 38-42, col.3, lines 57-58, automatically remove the event from the log without user intervention). Justice discloses automatically update the event list in the condition being resolved.

Justice does not explicitly disclose, severity indicator of said previous event; determining said resolution of event in real-time and changing a severity indicator of said previous event dependent on said determining step; depending on said severity indicator.

The concept of having a severity indicator, of the event, said severity indicator dependent on an event type and a device type is a well known concept. For instant, Fuss teaches indicate the critical of a problem with color coded (see col.6, lines 14-35) and critical indicator depended on event type and device type (see Fuss col.5, lines 4-5, minor problem (severity indicator) such as broken cable (event type) at PC (device type)).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fuss to the method of Justice to include

severity indicator, severity indicator depended on event type and device type for the purpose of efficiently managing the network.

The combination of Justice and Fuss does not teach determining the resolution of event in real-time and changing a severity indicator of said previous event dependent on said determining step; depending on said severity indicator.

However the concept of determining network event resolution in real-time and changing the severity indication is a well-known concept in the networking art. For instant, Johnson discloses a network management system that having the capability of facilitate real-time problem resolution and changing the severity indicators by changing the color code on the interface (see Johnson col.1, lines 29-30; col.2, lines 18-30; col.5, lines 58-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson to the method of Justice –Roy include determining in real-time and changing the severity indicators for the purpose of allowing for the immediate execution of remedial actions to minimize adverse consequence potential associated with the event (see Johnson col.3, lines 4-6).

**As regarding claim 2**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses if said network management data indicates said resolution of a previous event, said method further comprises marking said previous event as resolved (see Justice, Fig.8, mark date and time of resolved event).

**As regarding claim 3**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses said network management data is processed in response to said network management system receiving network management data from said network (see Justice, col.1, lines 25-67).

**As regarding claim 4**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses said network management data comprising values of a monitored characteristic of a part of said network for which an event is generated if said monitored value exceeds a predetermined threshold (see Justice col.3, lines19-67, col.4, lines 1-33; also see Fig.5, said log represents said list of action and recurring action, determine if said event in the log is resolved, then said management program updates said event list in response to said condition being resolved, the previous event is just an event in the log), wherein said event list includes an unresolved previous event for the monitored characteristic, wherein said step of receiving network management data comprises receiving a value for said monitored characteristic, and said step of determining comprises considering whether said monitored value has been below said predetermined threshold for a preceding time period, and if so determining that said received value indicates said resolution of said unresolved previous event (see Justice col.3, lines19-67, col.4, lines 1-33; also see Fig.5, the log represents the list of action and recurring action, determine if the event in the log is resolved, then the management program updates the event list in response to the condition being resolved, the previous event is just an event in the log).

**As regarding claim 5**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses in response to receiving said network management data, comparing a first received value for said monitored characteristic with said predefined threshold, and if said value is below said predefined threshold, starting a timer, said timer expiring at said end a predefined time period (see Justice col.3, lines 26-67, col.4, lines 1-33).

**As regarding claim 6**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses comparing each subsequent received value for said monitored characteristic with said predefined threshold, and if any value exceeds said threshold canceling said timer (see Justice Col.3, lines 26-67, col.4, lines 1-33).

**As regarding claim 7**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses when said timer expires; determining that said monitored value has been below said predetermined threshold for said preceding time period (see Justice Col.3, lines 26-67, col.4, lines 1-33).

**As regarding claim 8**, the limitations are similar to limitation of rejected claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1, in addition Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses periodically receiving a value for said monitored characteristic (see Justice, col.4, lines 19-33); if a received value exceeds a predetermined threshold for said monitored characteristic generating an event (see Justice, col.3, lines 43-67, col.4, lines 1-17); and thereafter, periodically considering whether said monitored value has been below said predetermined threshold for a preceding time period, and if so determining

that said event is resolved (see Justice col.3, lines 26-67). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 8.

**As regarding claim 9**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses said preceding time period is an immediately preceding predetermined time period, and said step of periodically considering comprises considering whether said monitored value has been below said predetermined threshold for said immediately preceding time period in response to each subsequently received value (see Justice col.3, lines 19-67, col.4, lines 1-33).

**As regarding claim 10**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses said step of considering determines that said event is resolved; said method further comprises marking said event as resolved (see Justice Figure 8, mark the date of the resolved event).

**As regarding claim 11**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses said network management data relating to an asynchronous Trap being received by said network management system, wherein said step of determining comprises considering if said Trap indicates said possible resolution of an event in an event log (see Justice, col.3, lines 14-67).

**As regarding claim 12**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses if said Trap indicates said possible resolution of an event in an event log, said step of determining further

comprises considering whether said event log includes a previously received event that is resolved by said Trap (see Justice col.3, lines 14-67).

**As regarding claim 19**, the limitations are similar to limitation of rejected claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1, in addition Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses a method for processing event data generated by a network management system during said monitoring of a network (see Johnson col.5, lines 47-67; col.6, lines 1-8) said method processing event data relating to events previously generated by said network management system a plurality of times and which may be entered in said event log as a recurring event (see Justice col.1, lines 25-67, col.3, lines 26-67; col.4, lines 1-33, also see Fig.5, the log represents the list of action and recurring action, determine if the event in the log is resolved, then the management program updates the event list in response to the condition being resolved, the previous event is just an event in the log, event 11000 appeared three times in the log, also see Figure.8, upgrade system Rom appeared twice with two different time periods), determining if an event has already been logged a predetermined number of times in an event list, and if so automatically identifying a recurring event to be processed from said event list (see Justice col.1, lines 25-67, col.3, lines 26-67; col.4, lines 1-33, also see Fig.5); and considering whether said condition which caused said event to be generated has occurred in a preceding time period (see Justice col.1, lines 25-67, col.3, lines 26-67; col.4, lines 1-33, also see Fig.5). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 19.

**As regarding claim 20**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses if said step of considering determines that said condition which caused said event to be generated has not occurred in said preceding time period, determining said event to be resolved (see Justice col.1, lines 25-67, col.3, lines 26-67; col.4, lines 1-33, also see Fig.5, the log represents the list of action and recurring action, determine if the event in the log is resolved, then the management program updates the event list in response to the condition being resolved, the previous event is just an event in the log).

**As regarding claim 21**, Justice-Fuss-Johnson discloses mark said event in said event list as resolved (see Johnson col.6, lines 39-41). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 21.

**As regarding claim 22**, the limitations are similar to claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1.

**As regarding claims 23-25**, the limitations are similar to claims 1-4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-4.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP



§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUYEN M. DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. M. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452